



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/041,141 | 01/03/2002 | Radhika Aggarwal | RSW920010112US1 | 2419 |

7590 09/02/2005

CHRISTOPHER & WEISBERG P.A.
200 EAST LAS OLAS BOULEVARD-SUITE 2040
FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33301

EXAMINER

HUYNH, THU V

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2178

DATE MAILED: 09/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/041,141

Applicant(s)

AGGARWAL ET AL.

Examiner

Thu V. Huynh

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 August 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: RCE filed on 08/10/2005 to application filed on 01/03/2002.
2. Claims 1-10 are pending in the case. Claims 1 and 6 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

(b) This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. **Claims 1-2, 5-7, 10 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Upton et al., US 2003/0105884 A1, provisional filed 10/2001, in view of Jeffries et al., US 6,094,529, filed 12/1996 as supplied by the Applicants in IDS filed 01/03/2002, and "Instant HTML", Homer et al., copyright 1997, pages 88-101.**

Regarding independent claim 1, Upton teaches the steps of:

- detecting in a form-based submit, at least one validation error based upon a value provided through an input-element in a markup specified form (Upton, col.5, paragraph 62; user fill-out data and submits an html form, validating data in submitted form to detect invalid data);

Art Unit: 2178

- inserting a row in said markup specified form in a position which is proximate to said input element (Upton, col.5, paragraph 62, redisplaying the form with error message next to each erroneous field. This inherently disclose inserting a text row next to erroneous field in the html form);
- selecting error text corresponding to said validation error and inserting said selected error text in said row (Upton, col.5, paragraph 62, redisplaying the form with error message next to each erroneous field); and
- serving said markup specified form in a response to said form-based submit (Upton, col.5, paragraph 62).

Upton does not explicitly disclose that said row having a background color which differs from other colors which a visible in proximity to said inserted row; inserting an anchor tag in said markup specified form in a position which is proximate to said input element; and in a response to said form-based submit, said response referring said anchor tag.

Jeffries teaches error message is highlighted, such as by underlining, changing the background color to provide a visual indicator (Jeffries, col.3, lines 33-36 and col.5, lines 24-33).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Jeffries' visual indicator in error message into Upton's error message in html form to insert error text message having a background color which differs from other colors which a visible in proximity to said insert error text, since this would have provided a visual indicator for the user to focus on erroneous field in the html form. It is also noted that highlighting error data or error text field in an html form as a visual indicator for the user re-entries the data was well known in the art at the time the invention was made.

Homer teaches including an anchor within a page so that, when we load the page, that part of the document is automatically scrolled into view (Homer, page 88, “Anchors Within A Page” section; placing the anchor tag with name “dalmation” in section Dalmatians to directly scroll to that section when the page dog.html is loaded).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Homer’s teaching into Upton’s redisplay form to insert an anchor tag in the html form in a position which is proximate to said input element, since this would have allowed when the user submit the html form, error part of the html form is automatically scrolled into view Homer’s disclosed above for the user enter a correct data as. This would have facilitated the user to re-enter the data when the error field is directly provided.

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Upton does not explicitly disclose inserting an error image adjacent to said input-element.

Jeffries teaches insert a glyph near highlighting text error message to provide a visual indicator (Jeffries, col.3, lines 33-36 and col.5, lines 24-33).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Jeffries’ glyph visual indicator in error message into Upton’s error message in html form to insert a image/glyph near the error text message, since this would have provided a visual indicator for the user to focus on erroneous field in the html form.

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent on claim 4. Refer to the rationale relied to reject claim 1, Upton, Jefferies and Homer teach inserting an anchor tag in said markup specified form in a position which is proximate to said input element. Homer also teaches the anchor tag place before the section to be automatically displayed (Homer, page 97, "Using Anchors in Your Pages" section).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Homer's teaching into Upton's redisplay form to insert an anchor tag in the html form in a position which is proximate but before to said input element, since placing the anchor tag before the error section would have allowed the error part of the html form is automatically scrolled into view as Homer's disclosed above for the user enter a correct data as. This would have facilitated the user to re-enter the data when the error field is directly provided.

Claims 6-7 and 10 are for a computer readable medium performing the method of claims 1-2 and 5, respectively and are rejected under the same rationale.

5. Claims 3-4, 8-9 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Upton in view of Jeffries and Homer as applied to claims 1 and 6 above, and further in view of Hartman, US 6,615,226 B1, filed 09/1997.

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Upton, Jefferies and Homer teaches display error message proximate to said input element (error field) as explained above.

However, Upton does not explicitly disclose determining whether said markup specified form

Art Unit: 2178

contained multiple views, one of said multiple view containing said input-element and if it is determined that said markup specified form contains multiple views, identifying said one of said multiple views and setting said identified one of said multiple views to a visible status

Hartman teaches a markup specified form contained multiple views, one of said multiple view containing said input-element (error field) (Hartman, col.9, lines 38-59).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Hartman's teaching and Upton to includes the steps of determining said markup specified form contains multiple views, identifying said one of said multiple views and setting said identified one of said multiple views to a visible status, since this would have allowed error message to be displayed proximity to error field in both simple or/and complex form which contains multiple view to inform error for the user re-entries, since

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Upton, Jefferies and Homer teaches inserting an error message row in said markup specified form in a position which is proximate to said input element, said error message row having a background color which differs from other colors which are visible in proximity to said inserted row in claim 1 above. Upton does not explicitly disclose that said position is proximate to but below said input element.

Hartman teaches displaying error message in close proximity but below said input element (Hartman, col.9, lines 55-59).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Hartman and Upton to provide the error message on many

Art Unit: 2178

different position proximate to the error input element to inform the user of error, since below or/and next is one form of proximate position.

Claims 8-9 are for a computer readable medium performing the method of claims 3-4, respectively and are rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed on 08/10/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that “as stated on paragraph (4.) on page 2 of the Declaration, “[a]t the time of submitting the Disclosure an experiment prototype of the Invention had been created and work had begun in producing a production version of the Invention” and conclude “actual reduction to practice had been achieved by Applicants”.

This is not persuasive. The Declaration filed on 12/21/2004 fails to provide evidence(s) to show that the prototype was actually reduced to practice. The Declaration provides “a disclosure document” which “describing an embodiment of the Invention”. The disclosure document includes demonstration of error message displayed in a row below a user input field. However, the disclosure does not provide test results demonstrate that the test was in fact successful as the disclosure described. Therefore, the evidence is not persuasive and the rejection is being maintained.

Art Unit: 2178

Applicants provide activities (on page 7 of the argument) that are summarized as following:

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Prior October, 2001 | Applicants conceived of the present applicant's invention. |
| October 18, 2001 | Upton's filing date. |
| October 29, 2001 | Applicants reviewed a final draft of the application. |
| November 8, 2001 | Application executed the "Declaration of Power of Attorney for Patent Application" for the present application. |
| November 22, 2001 | Thanksgiving day. |
| December 25, 2001 | Christmas day. |
| January 1, 2002 | New Year day. |
| January 3, 2002 | Present application's filing date. |

Applicants argue that, "period of time between the execution date of the Declaration and Power of Attorney for Patent Application and the filing date of the present application is not unreasonable" and conclude that "attorneys exercised reasonable diligence in filing the present patent application".

This is not persuasive. Based upon the evidence presented, there is an apparent period lacking activity and explanation from November 8, 2001 until January 3, 2002. Although, applicants points out that there are three holidays in this period, however, applicants does not explain activities involving to this application on this period except such holidays. Therefore, the declaration fails to provide activities and particular facts associated with time that applicants are relying on to show completion without unexplained time gaps (It is also noted that November

Art Unit: 2178

8, 2001 does not mentioned in the Declaration). Since the evidence is not persuasive, the rejection is being maintained.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu V Huynh whose telephone number is (571) 272-4126. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TVH
August 29, 2005

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
8/31/2005